

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5933

Recall for a moment the recent San Francisco hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee. What fact enters your mind first? The rioting. Who stirred up the rioting? Known Communists.

What would have happened without the demonstrations? The hearing would have been orderly and brief newspaper reports would have been written instead of glaring headlines.

If reputations were damaged, the rioting and the resulting headlines did it. And who incited the riots? Known Communists. It necessarily follows that the object of the demonstrations, whether participants knew it or not, was not to preserve civil liberties, but to discredit the committee.

Forget for a moment the Communists who participated and the gory details of the San Francisco incident. Ask this question: What is the justification for this committee?

Here it is in simple terms: The security of the United States is the business of Congress. Most Congressmen feel that the Communist conspiracy is a threat to our security. Therefore, Congress should have a committee to investigate communism to alert the public to its danger and to revise our laws to cope with that danger.

This objective and this tactic of the Communist Party of discrediting the committee which seeks to expose the Communist conspiracy is to me the most serious threat to our efforts to resist internal subversion.

It was Pope Pius XI in 1937 who said, in response to a searching question about communism, "How is it possible that such a system long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?" He answered his own question in these words: "The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism."

When our enemy was Nazi Germany our Government and military leaders studied every detail of the enemy and his strategies. One of our great generals was George S. Patton. Early in World War II when the Germans were advancing, General Patton was asked one day if he wasn't discouraged. His answer was precise: "I have studied the German for 40 years. I have read the memoirs of his great men. I have studied every detail of all his military campaigns. I have attended some of his staff courses. I know exactly how he will react under any given set of circumstances. He does not know what I will do. For this reason when the time comes I shall beat the hell out of him."

And this he did.

We can no more save our Republic from communism merely by saying we are against communism than we can cure a cancer by saying we are against cancer. To conquer the cancer we must kill it or it must kill us.

But to cure cancer, to cure any disease, or to defeat communism we must know how serious it is. Knowing how serious it is, we will not fall prey to the overgeneralization that civil liberties must not be restricted even when they are against the interest of the entire Nation. We will continue the Un-American Activities and other congressional committees and give them freedom to investigate Communists and pro-Communists. We will keep present anti-Communists laws and we will strengthen them. We will strengthen security provisions and the laws which keep Communists out of our government. We will restore to the executive branch the right to question aliens awaiting deportation and give it the right to deny passports for those who refuse to sign non-Communist affidavits. We will say to ourselves that no man, regardless of his occupation, is immune from investigation when there is reasonable cause to believe

that his actions are aiding the Communist conspiracy.

If we do these things we will act positively against communism and repudiate our past policy of reacting too late with too little.

With such an attitude, and only with such an attitude, can we lick the Communist conspiracy and keep faith with those we honor today—the men who have given their lives in order that we might live as free men and women.

I recall the story of the lost child on a Kansas prairie on one of the coldest nights the prairie had known in years. After hours of searching the neighbors of the frightened family decided they would all join hands and walk across the prairie in an effort to find the little boy. In so doing they covered every square inch of the prairie. After a short time they found the boy but unfortunately he had succumbed to the cold and was dead. The bereaved father gathered the boy into his arms and through his sobs and tears said, "God, why didn't we join hands sooner?"

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this year, the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association, of Oakdale, Wis., celebrates its 25th anniversary.

During its 25 years of service, this fine co-op has written a commendable record of service; in addition, it has played an important role in the economy of the community. For such a record of constructive work, the members, officers, and employees deserve congratulations.

At the 25th annual meeting, the members of the co-op adopted a number of resolutions, many relating to legislation pending before Congress.

Recently, these resolutions were forwarded to me by Manager Lloyd McCaskey. I request unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—OAKDALE 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Whereas the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association in 1960 is entering into its 25th year of existence; and

Whereas tremendous progress has been made by the association in the years of its existence toward the providing of service to its members now totaling 4,293; and

Whereas the splendid cooperation of members, officers, employees, past and present have been entirely responsible for the growth and success of the association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association extend to all former and present officers, employees and members its grateful thanks.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—REA LOAN SOURCE AND INTEREST RATES

Whereas the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association by virtue of its operating in

predominately rural communities faces inherent handicaps in providing adequate and full service to all its consumers, not faced by its competitive privately owned utilities with more consumers per mile than Oakdale; and

Whereas this and other handicaps prevent Oakdale from being strictly competitive with private investor owned utilities operating in metropolitan areas with high density of population and high industrial loads; and

Whereas the need for an adequate source of low interest rate capital to finance expansion and new construction to serve growing needs, continues; and

Whereas certain groups are urging legislation to force rural electrical systems into the private money market which would result in increased interest rates on its capital needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association, That our congressional representatives be urged to oppose any and all legislation which would remove the Rural Electrification Administration from being our source of capital loan funds and which would in any way increase the prevailing interest rate.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—HEADWATER STORAGE BILL

Whereas bill H.R. 7201 known variously as the upstream benefit bill, the downstream benefit bill and the headwater storage bill is due to come up for consideration before the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas said bill if passed will tend to confer unearned, windfall benefits upon private power companies owning a dam upstream from a Federal dam at the ultimate expense of rural electric systems which purchase all or part of their power from Federal hydro projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 25th annual meeting of the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association go on record as opposing unrestricted headwater benefit payments on Federal hydroelectric developments and its opposition to bill H.R. 7201.

J. C. CURTIS,
ALBERT REMINGTON,
WILLARD BURR PILE,
Resolutions Committee.

True Feeling of the Japanese People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a Japanese trade association describes the feelings of one group of people for the United States.

This letter was written to a former mayor of Seattle who has visited Japan in the interest of good will on several occasions.

I am confident the majority of the Japanese people entertain a friendly feeling for the United States in spite of recent Communist-stimulated activities and understandable but misguided pacifist manifestations.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. DEVIN: It is with deepest regret that we had to face the stark reality of our Government being compelled to solicit postponement of the much anticipated visit of President Eisenhower to our country, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the sign-

ing of Treaty of Amity between the United States and Japan. Agitation manifested at Haneda Airport of Tokyo, upon the arrival of White House Secretary James Hagerty to arrange for the President's visit, had grown to unbecoming proportions, culminating in the necessity of our Government's most reluctant decision of June 16.

The decision was greatest disappointment to the largest majority of our people who were all looking forward to welcome one of the greatest and most honorable guests to our country we ever had the honor to welcome. It would have afforded them that much desired opportunity for them to manifest their utmost gratitude for the President's inestimable contribution to the promotion of friendly relationship between our two countries.

We sincerely hope that this most unfortunate circumstance will not be misunderstood by Americans at large. Manifestations of violence shown by a very small minority in Tokyo, certainly do not represent feeling of the Japanese people. We are all aiming and striving for everlasting friendship between our two countries.

We are taking the liberty of addressing you these few lines to ask you for your sympathetic understanding on the matter and for your kind cooperation in explaining our true sentiment on this occasion to your friends and associates.

Renewing our regret for this most unexpected and unfortunate turn of events and soliciting your valuable assistance in conveying the true feeling of our people to your colleagues, we are

Yours very truly,

KOBE FOREIGN TRADE ASSOCIATION,
TORAMITSU YASUDA, President.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of July 2, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The battle over adjournment was won by the Democrats. Instead of finishing all work and adjourning "sine die" (until the next Congress), the Democrat leadership decided to recess and to convene again in August. We could have easily finished our work. This leaves unanswered the question, "Why?" The reason will become evident later—but only to those people who concern themselves in learning what Congress is doing.

I summarized my views during consideration of the sugar bill in this way: "Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that action against Cuba is long overdue. Why subsidize your enemy? Why delay responsible action as we have done up to this point? Why has the House Democrat leadership delayed so long in programming this bill before committee and Congress? As we face a recess adjournment instead of adjournment sine die, I am reminded once again of the failure of Democrat leadership to provide leadership. Obviously something must be done, and done now, to stop this expensive subsidy to Cuba. Meanwhile, we can let our domestic producers provide the sugar, and also buy from friendly allies." While the sugar bill is a good ex-

ample of the failure of Democrat leadership, there are many others.

The minimum-wage battle wasn't over whether or not to hike the amount and increase the number of people covered, but over how much of an increase would be made in each instance. The radical and far-reaching bill brought to the floor by the Education and Labor Committee and supported by an overwhelming majority of Democrats was amended into a moderate measure by the bipartisan effort of almost all the Republicans, including me, and a goodly number of southern Democrats. The vote on the "moderating" amendment was close, 211 to 203. My own view was stated bluntly and succinctly to the House: "Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to set wages. Therefore, I oppose minimum-wage laws." That view was supported by only 71 others in the vote on final passage. The count, 341 to 72.

All Federal employees, including postal workers, received a substantial pay raise when both Houses of Congress voted to override President Eisenhower's veto of the something-for-everybody election-year package Congress had passed earlier. Thus, we kicked another three-quarters-of-a-billion-dollar hole in the administration budget. My views on this sort of politicking were stated at the time of the vote in the House:

"Mr. Speaker, in overriding the President's veto of this pay increase we have capitulated to the political pressure of lobbyists, in this case representing the postal workers' unions. We are guilty of permitting legislative dictation. If one pressure group can do it, so can others. Then in the aggregate total our representative government will fail. No longer will we have judicious study of legislation, but roughshod political dictation. This course can only result in the disintegration of our form of government and our society of free people.

"I condemn this pay raise as factually wrong and financially unsound, though politically expedient. Therefore, I voted to uphold the veto. The President's statement contains the facts, including his recommendation that the temporary 2.5 percent raise already in effect be made permanent, and indicating his willingness to go along with a further reasonable hike commensurate with increased living costs.

"That this bill goes far beyond those reasonable norms is manifest. To the extent that it does, we are simply rewarding one group—well organized Federal employees—at the expense of all other taxpayers. At this time, as much as ever, legislators need to exercise self-discipline, letting November's votes fall where they may."

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, is the guest of my final television program of the current series. Senator GOLDWATER, a frequent visitor to Dallas, discussed his new book, "The Conscience of a Conservative," with me, going into the true definitions of the terms "conservative," "liberal," and "radical." This program will be shown Sunday morning, July 10, over WFAA-TV.

Cairo and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to an important article appearing in the current

issue—No. 56, summer 1960—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. I refer to the article Cairo and the Panama Canal, an original analysis of activities by President Nasser's agents in Panama.

This article states that the Cairo regime in association with the Castro government, has been endeavoring to undermine the U.S. position at the Panama Canal and incites Panamanians against the United States while receiving tens of millions of dollars from the U.S. Treasury.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a most unhappy situation and certainly deserves the closest attention of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAIRO AND THE PANAMA CANAL

Testifying before a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in April of this year, Mr. G. Lewis Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, assured Members of Congress that there was "progress in normalization of our relations with the United Arab Republic." It would seem to us that in the lexicon of international diplomacy "normalization of relations" between countries implies that each side has agreed by deed as well as word to respect the rights and interest of the other. Moreover, it would also seem to mean that each side has taken upon itself the obligation not to commit any acts which would seriously damage and/or discredit the interests of the other country. If we judge "normalization of relations" by these standards, then we must frankly express our astonishment at Mr. Jones' optimism.

SOUTH OF THE BORDER

Certainly, Cairo's blacklisting of U.S.-owned ships and harassment of American seamen by Egyptian officials and their minions cannot be regarded as proof that the U.A.R. has at last begun to respect the interests of the United States. However, nowhere do we find a more meaningful example of Nasser's deliberate aim to undermine the position of the United States than in Latin America. Comparatively little has been written about this subject, but this does not mean that it is of no significance. On the contrary, recent developments clearly indicate that the U.A.R. is steadily building up its apparatus of subversion south of our borders and is employing all of the tricks it has learned in its drive to damage the standing of the West in Africa and in Asia.

It is true, of course, that Egypt is still a very poor country and certainly does not possess the resources, let us say, of the Soviets, in probing Latin America. Nevertheless, given this disadvantage, the Cairo regime is making the best out of it. The move is not a massive one as yet. On the contrary, it appears to be primarily concentrated on Cuba and Panama. The reason for this concentration is not only due to the lack of resources but is also related to the fact that in both of these countries there are enormous opportunities for inflicting grave harm on the security interests of the United States.

CAIRO AND CUBA

Cuba is in the throes of a highly emotionally charged anti-American campaign sponsored by the Castro government. Consequently, Cuba has become the focal point of all sorts of anti-American intrigue and

A5932

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 15

tive agreement by which recognition was extended, Soviet Russia used her embassies and consulates as centers of espionage, subversion, and propaganda. In spite of this some Americans say that we were morally wrong in sending a U-2 plane 60,000 feet over Russia into air which, to my knowledge, no international lawyer has said belongs to Russia. And we do it for the purpose of learning the facts which are necessary to prevent the world from being plunged into another war.

Another objective is to halt nuclear tests, and well meaning and sincere individuals in this country support the same objective. In so doing they do not feel that they are supporting Russia but merely supporting what is good for mankind.

Obviously nuclear tests should be halted; but can they be halted without some assurance that the Russians will actually live up to agreements? Look at the record of Russian violation of their solemn commitments.

During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists. All this talk led to 52 major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them.

The Communists have followed Lenin's dictum about treaties and agreements: "Promises are like piecrusts—made to be broken."

In the 3 years prior to 1958 the United States met 73 times at Geneva with the Chinese Reds to negotiate a release of 450 American prisoners. How many American servicemen have been accounted for or released?

In light of such a record, how can anyone plead for limiting our military potential by refusing to develop weapons through nuclear testing when we have no assurance that Russia will do the same? Suspending of nuclear tests unilaterally without guarantees that Russia will adhere to her agreement is exactly what Russia wants.

Some counter this argument and say, "Well, we are the peace-loving country, we should prove to the world that we are sincere by taking the first step to relieve tensions."

I am truly concerned about the attitude in some circles that the United States must take a succession of first steps. If we do and it is a step backward and Russia doesn't take a similar step, then we have a new and compromised position which isn't as good as the position we occupied before. Then there will be a new status quo and after a time you can expect these same people to urge a new and bold first step from the new position. Can't they see that such a policy means nothing in the world but a gradual retreat toward slavery?

Understand that I do not say for 1 minute that anyone who advocates unilateral suspension of nuclear testing is knowingly serving the Communist cause. But whether he knows it or not, and I am sure he does not in most cases, he is truly giving the Communists what they want.

Another Communist objective which is inadvertently served by many innocent Americans is that of propaganda. Communists are spending \$3 billion a year on propaganda which is reaching every city and hamlet in our Nation. In one day the Communist propaganda coming through New York City alone fills three large warehouses and not a single piece is labeled "Communist propaganda" as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

In viewing my daily congressional mail it is amazing to me to see the same words crop up in the letters from sincere and unsuspecting constituents that one sees in this type of Communist propaganda. Reference to the FBI as "a Nazi-like gestapo," to the House Un-American Activities Committee members as Fascists and witch hunters are repeated each day by people who haven't

the slightest idea how those phrases were planted in their minds. If they were to know, they would realize that this is the product of the Soviet propaganda machine operating on \$3 billion per year.

Another objective of the Communist conspiracy is to humiliate the United States.

It is well known that Communists masterminded the insulting demonstration against Vice President Nixon which included spitting on him and the throwing of rocks and garbage.

Some may doubt, but I do not, that the deeds of Fidel Castro in Cuba are masterminded by the international Communist conspiracy.

Recently in our city of San Francisco, known Communist agitators were seen in the crowd whipping young college students into a frenzy to demonstrate against the House Un-American Activities Committee. It strikes me as something more than coincidence that these demonstrations were organized on the weekend which preceded the ill-fated summit conference and were prominently played up in the Russian press as a demonstration by the American people against their Government and one of its congressional committees. I doubt seriously that these young students demonstrating before the San Francisco city hall, some of them not ready to shave and some who refuse to as all good beatniks should, none of them dry behind the ears, actually knew that they were being used as tools of trained Communist organizers.

In the crowd of students and beatniks at San Francisco, were known Communist agitators who were passing out literature that had been mailed directly from the Congress of the United States.

Though it may be undignified I can only say that had one of the students been my child there would have been a very urgent date between me and that child in the woodshed.

Another objective of the Communist conspiracy is to stimulate a peace offensive. Let me quote once again the words of Dmitri Manuilski, "the bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record."

Remember the Palo Alto Peace Club, now officially listed by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive? And there are many other organizations which fall for the Communist peace offensive and by no stretch of the imagination can be considered as disloyal or subversive. But disloyal or loyal they are still influenced and taken in by the Communist peace offensive. These people urge us to take bold first steps on the presumption that Khrushchev and other Kremlin leaders will negotiate in good faith and will keep their agreement. This belief is held in spite of the long record of Soviet violations of their solemn promises.

My words are not those of a warmonger. I sincerely do believe in peace and sincerely believe we should do everything reasonable to achieve it. But I repeat that a succession of unilateral first steps can mean nothing but a gradual retreat toward slavery. It is time the American people were alerted to what a Communist peace offensive really means and stopped serving it in their wishful thinking.

Another of the major Communist objectives is to nullify all anti-Communist legislation. On January 16, 1958, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, testified that 49 of the top 108 Communists convicted by Federal juries under the Smith Act have been set free by Supreme Court decisions. The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 has been nullified by decisions of our own courts, and so have the antisedition laws of 44 States. This is not preservation of civil liberties, this is giving it away.

And the last Communist objective which I will discuss is muzzling the FBI and congressional investigations. For years the Communist Party has poured out its most hysterical language against what the Reds call the gestapo-like FBI.

During the month of May 1959, high school seniors applying for admission to the University of California took an examination in which they were required to write a 500-word essay on 1 of 12 topics. The seventh topic of the 12 contained the following language: "What are the dangers to a democracy of a national policelike organization, like the FBI, which operates secretly and is unresponsive to public criticism?" This statement is absolutely untrue. In the first place the FBI is not a national police organization, but works with State and local police authorities. Secondly, it is responsive to public opinion because the Director of the FBI reports to the Attorney General who in turn reports to the President and who in turn is responsible to the people. It gets its funds from a Congress which certainly is responsive to public opinion.

The university has since disavowed the question and apologized to the FBI.

I shall not make the assertion that this question was deliberate service to the Communist conspiracy. But whether it was deliberate or not, the fact still remains that one of our great universities imprinted the fact upon young minds that the FBI was a sinister organization. This is the Communist line and whether it was intentionally planted or not is immaterial. The fact still remains that the Communist cause was served.

It is well known that card-carrying, identified Communists are registered as lobbyists in the Congress of the United States. Is it wrong for a congressional committee to expose this fact to the public and tell them about it?

Let me quote from a speech made in the House of Representatives on May 5 by my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable GORDON SCHERER, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He says:

"To accomplish its objective of destroying the Committee on Un-American Activities, this Communist-controlled group (the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee) has sent its cohorts into cities throughout the United States in advance of committee hearings. Its paid agents have done everything possible in advance of, and even during, such hearings to stir up animosity, contempt, and hatred for the committee. Its agents have circulated petitions; appeared on radio programs; arranged meetings, rallies, and picket lines; issued press releases; and placed ads in newspapers."

Mind you this speech was made on May 5, which is exactly 1 week before the recent hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in the city hall at San Francisco. Wouldn't you say from hearing that quotation that my colleague from Ohio was a prophet? Certainly there were petitions, there were radio programs, meetings arranged, there were rallies and picket lines, there were ads in newspapers.

Unfortunately these ads and these petitions told outright lies. What is more unfortunate is that those lies came from a speech by a Member of the House on the floor of the House of Representatives. This speech said, "that the committee had subpoenaed 110 public schoolteachers in early June 1959. Most of the subpoenas were served on the teachers at school at 9 in the morning on June 5."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not the truth. Upon checking the files of the committee it is found that of 101 subpoenas served, 97 teachers were actually served in their homes. Only four were served at their schools, and it is my understanding from unofficial resources that these four were not served in their classrooms.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5931

rededicate ourselves today to the preservation of the things for which they died.

They died to preserve liberty. Today we must rededicate ourselves to the same purpose.

Preservation of liberty requires strength—the strength to meet and conquer military aggression.

The much discussed U-2 plane flight to a depth of 1,300 miles over Russia clearly shows that our military strength has been underestimated in many circles. Our Strategic Air Command has been telling us for years that they have the ability to penetrate and destroy Russia. This ability has been described in detail to those of us who have access to classified material because of our membership on certain committees and it has also been given to the general public. But for some reason or other some have chosen to disregard the facts.

The U-2 incident shows that Russia can be penetrated and can be destroyed.

It is important to mention here that most criticism about our military defense system has been of the so-called missile gap. While it is true that Russia does possess more ICBM's than do our forces, it is also true that when everything is taken into consideration—all missiles, all planes, all ships, and all ability to retaliate, the United States is now, and will remain a superior force to that of the Soviet Union.

But there is another strength far less dramatic and far more difficult to achieve which we need if we are to preserve the liberty which the men we honor today fought for and earned. This is the strength to resist subversion.

I am sorry to say that I have serious doubts about our ability to resist Communist subversion. I never fear the ability of the American people to resist aggression when they expect it. This is the reason our people have willingly voted \$40 billion defense budgets; because we know of the danger from Russian armament. But where the U-2 flights have given us the intelligence and the information necessary to build military strength, we have no reconnaissance flights to show us the strength and the danger of internal subversion. What small effort has been directed to alerting the American people of this danger from a Communist conspiracy has, I am sorry to say, been shot down by our own people.

In the book, "A Night to Remember," the story is told of the five iceberg warnings sent by wireless to the steamship *Titanic*. When the sixth message, "Look out for the icebergs," came in, the *Titanic's* wireless operator wired back, "Shut up, I'm busy." Thirty-five minutes later the ship, whose captain had said, "God himself could not sink it," was sinking.

The phrase "Remember Pearl Harbor" should remind us that we were cocksure and complacent before the afternoon of December 7, 1941. The much-maligned Dies committee reports of Japanese espionage by fishing vessels had been ridiculed as headline hunting—much as some of the effort of today to alert the public to the Communist conspiracy is also ridiculed. We even ignored the messages we intercepted in the broken Japanese code.

I well remember the famous commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking in the San Jose Civic Auditorium in November of 1941. Asked about the possibility of a war with Japan he replied, "I can best answer that with a bit of blank verse. 'That noise you hear in the Orient, them ain't sabers, neighbor, them's knees.'"

Since the close of World War II distinguished Americans have been warning us and one cannot help but wonder on this Memorial Day of 1960 if we shall heed these warnings.

In his speech to the 1957 national convention of the American Legion, Mr. J. Edgar

Hoover, chief of the FBI, said, "To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

Communist doctrine is known to be founded upon conspiracy. It has not changed.

The Communist master plan for world conquest was stated by Lenin in these words, "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

On another occasion Lenin added, "As long as capitalism remains, we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph."

In a speech to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in 1931 Dmitri Manuilski, at one time presiding officer of the United Nations Security Council, said, "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today of course we are not strong enough to attack. * * * So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. * * * The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent * * * will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Georgi Dimitrov advised the Lenin School of Political Warfare how to make use of innocents and dupes as he called them. "As Soviet power grows there will be a greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. * * * A university professor, who without being a party member, lends himself to the interest of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police."

Have these views so long held by Communists changed in recent years?

As late as September 17, 1955, Nikita Khrushchev warned us: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

On November 18, 1956, the same Khrushchev said, "Whether you like it or not history is on our side. We will bury you."

And just a few weeks ago in Paris, Khrushchev heaped insults upon our President and the American people as he dashed the hopes of peace-loving people before the summit conference even commenced.

I don't believe anyone in his right mind can say that Communist intentions have changed—nor have Communist techniques.

There is a Communist conspiracy. And it is well protected by our own law.

It is ironic that the very liberties, which the men we honor on this Memorial Day died to preserve, have been twisted and perverted to protect and shelter subversives and Communists who would destroy that liberty. I speak of the new interpretation of the commonly used phrase "civil liberties."

Traditionally our interpretation of an individual's rights was to consider them sacred except when they were in conflict with the rights of the Nation or the rights of other people. Under this concept of individual liberty we are prohibited from dumping garbage on our neighbor's front lawn because such an act would endanger the health of others. The same concept prohibits us from driving too fast because in so doing we place others in jeopardy. But the new concept of individual rights and civil liberties seems to be that they are supreme even above the rights and the best interest of the

Nation. Even our courts have held that the individual has the right to engage in subversion against his government. Look at some of our recent court decisions.

Our Supreme Court has denied the right of States to enforce their own seditious laws.

It has turned Communists loose who have taught the forcible overthrow of our Government with evil intent.

The Court has held that the State Department could not discharge a Government employee who had given secret military plans to the editor of a Communist magazine.

Our courts now say that a State attorney general does not have the right to ask a lecturer in a State university if he believed in communism.

It has said that the U.S. Attorney General did not have the right to ask an alien if he had recently attended Communist meetings.

The Court has ruled that Communists seeking the right to practice law need not answer questions about Communist affiliation.

It has questioned the right of Congress to investigate communism and suggested that it is broad scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens.

And to cap the climax the Court has ruled that the State Department must give a passport to Communists including one who was involved in the spy ring of Julius Rosenberg and was going to India to live with a Communist who had renounced his American citizenship.

With the greater strength that comes from this weakening of our laws, the Communists and their fellow travelers are hard at work at this very moment to achieve their objectives.

First of these objectives is the elimination of Federal and State security programs. Everyone admits that Government employment is not a right but a privilege. Yet the effect of many of the aforementioned Supreme Court decisions is to prevent the Federal and State Governments from withdrawing this privilege from those who associate with Communists and who are security risks. We are even required to give the dignity and protection of a U.S. passport to a Communist who leaves this country for the purpose of harming the country which issues the passport.

Many well meaning groups in this country whose loyalty is not in question, have swallowed the Communist propaganda campaign that security programs both Federal and State, smack of fascism and nazism. This genuine fear of a police state has been seized upon by Communist conspirators. Well meaning persons have, without knowing it, been fighting the Communist battle for them.

Another Communist objective is the recognition of Red China. The Communist espionage apparatus needs the diplomatic immunity of its embassies and consulates to set up spy centers. It needs the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to its spies and couriers and to receive back their reports and microfilm documents.

Many well meaning individuals have swallowed the Communist line, hook, line and sinker and have said in effect, "The Chinese Communist nation exists, why must we refuse to admit it? Wouldn't it be better to meet them face to face and gain access to their country? As long as they exist we cannot continue to refuse to recognize their existence." To these people I say, the greatest mistake this Nation ever made was the recognition of the Soviet Union. Four American Presidents refused to recognize the Communist government of Russia and it remained weak and ineffective so long as it was unrecognized. Communism began to spread through the world as soon as the United States extended diplomatic recognition in 1933, because, in violation of all international morality and even of the execu-

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5929

other reasons. Recognizing this, the New York Legislature recently passed a law at my request mandating the conversion of group health insurance policies to individual policies upon retirement at premium levels not exceeding 120 percent of prior payments. This measure represents a major advance, but not a complete solution. No one State can solve this problem alone. It is essentially a national problem.

From the carrier standpoint, health insurance for the aged is likely to be a most unprofitable type of business unless premium costs can be spread over all age groups. The latter is difficult in the competitive, experience-rating conditions which exist in the insurance industry.

For voluntary plans, there are serious financial problems in providing such coverage. In 1958, for example, I am advised that the Philadelphia Blue Cross collected \$3.5 million in premiums from its 65-and-over subscribers and paid out \$9.7 million to meet their hospital bills. Had the Blue Cross not spread this loss among all its subscribers, the premiums of the older subscribers would have been prohibitively high. At the same time, the increasing numbers of such high-cost subscribers not only raise costs for everyone, but threaten the very existence of the Blue Cross system.

It is now clear that some type of Federal Government action is needed to solve this problem—a fact recognized in the wide variety of plans now under consideration in the Congress. In 1954, as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I participated in developing an administration proposal for limited Government involvement through a Federal reinsurance system to assist voluntary health plans in undertaking broadened protection, including improved protection of the aged. The proposal was not adopted by Congress. Since then, the problem has become no less acute.

The issue has ceased to be whether to do anything at all. The issue is how best to do what so obviously needs to be done.

And the issue is immediate. Last Thursday, the House of Representatives passed a bill contemplating some medical care benefits, through Federal grants sharing costs with States, provided on a basis of need. This is an extremely limited measure—seemingly in the nature of an election-year stopgap. There is substantial evidence that the Senate during the coming week will begin serious consideration of expanding this measure into a comprehensive effort to meet the problem. I sincerely hope that this is the case.

Of the various proposed programs of health insurance for the aged, the best known are the Forand bill and the administration bill. There are many differences between these two bills, but the fundamental difference is in the two approaches to financing the proposed benefits. The Forand bill would increase the social security payroll tax to encompass health insurance for those over 65, while the administration bill proposes a Federal-State program of health insurance for older persons, paid for primarily by general tax revenues of the Federal and State governments, but with the older persons themselves (other than those of public assistance) paying an enrollment fee of \$24 a year.

As a businessman concerned with employee welfare, as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and as Governor of New York, I have been concerned with the health insurance question for many years. It seems to me that there are four grave weaknesses in the Forand measure.

1. The Forand bill would not provide health insurance coverage for any of the 4 million persons now over 65 years of age who are not included in the social security system.

2. It lacks any element of choice and would therefore tend to stifle further devel-

opment of voluntary health insurance for the aged in this country.

3. Administration of the Forand bill program would be under centralized Federal control with no flexibility for accommodation to varying conditions in the different States.

4. It fails to provide the standards needed to maintain the quality essential to good medical care.

In the administration bill, the basic flaw is the method of financing, which I regard as fiscally unsound. Instead of extending a proven contributory system of insurance—the administration bill provides subsidies from the general revenues, shared by the States and the Federal Government under an equalization formula.

Under a contributory system a definite percentage of the cost is born by those who ultimately receive the benefits. This provides a built-in safeguard against the constant pressure for irresponsible and extravagant additions to the scheme which is politically difficult to resist. The administration plan would be particularly vulnerable to such pressure, based as it is on the concept of subsidy.

The financing of the administration plan also would represent a serious financial drain on the States; New York, for example, would have to allocate to the program nearly 10 percent of its current State purposes budget if it participated. It is likely that a number of States would decide not to participate at all, as would be their right.

In addition, the administration bill has "means test," deductible and coinsurance features unrealistically limiting benefits and requiring cumbersome and costly administrative mechanisms in all 50 States. It does, however, provide for minimum standards of care and its benefits would come closer to meeting the medical care needs of the aged than do those of the Forand bill.

What, then, are the elements of a workable approach? In my judgment, we must begin with the principle that our basic reliance for health insurance protection for the population as a whole should be voluntary health insurance. But, recognizing the special problem of insuring the health of the aged, I believe Congress should enact a program based on the principles I shall set forth.

In considering these principles, we should keep in mind that taxes levied by the Government to support a health insurance system are equally compulsory, whether they are in the form of general revenue taxes or earmarked payroll taxes. Hence, the alleged distinction between plans on the basis of "voluntary" versus "compulsory" is, in my opinion, both illusory and irrelevant insofar as financing is concerned. As to the voluntary or compulsory nature of the receipt of benefits, I shall comment further.

The principles I advocate are these:

1. Health insurance should be provided for as many as possible over 65 without reference to a means test.

The concept of an "earned benefit" resulting from a contributory system is an important one to retain—one which stresses individual initiative and dignity in our society.

2. The basic mechanism for achieving this should be the contributory social insurance system, supported by payroll taxes, which exists in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system. A separate "health benefit trust fund" should be established in this system to account for the taxes received and benefits paid.

This well-administered system has proved to be effective and economical. Its contributory nature has been completely accepted and is, indeed, strongly supported by employees as well as their employers.

3. The full payroll-tax increase required to finance the additional health benefits should be enacted at the same time as the new benefits.

The maximum additional tax needed for the benefits I propose would be one-half of 1 percent for employees and the same amount for employers.

4. Some 4 million persons over age 65 are not covered by OASDI insurance. Nearly half of these are recipients of old-age assistance payments, paid from Federal, State, and local general revenues. A second group among these 4 million are receiving retirement benefits from the civil service, railroad retirement, or other programs. A third group receive their support from other personal resources or are dependent on others for their support.

Those older persons not eligible for benefits under the OASDI system must, nevertheless, have comparable health insurance protection available to them.

I believe that the Federal program should permit payments into the separate health benefit trust fund for the purchase of the same health protection for these persons as would be available to retired OASDI beneficiaries. The Federal Government should match according to a formula any payments which an individual State wishes to provide to assist its older persons not eligible for OASDI in purchasing the OASDI health benefits. The Federal Government would also, of course, continue to provide Federal matching grants for old-age assistance payments, including those for medical care purposes.

5. Each OASDI beneficiary eligible for the statutory health benefits should be given an option to forgo those benefits in favor of receiving a special monthly cash benefit added to his regular social security check, provided he presented proof that he carried a health insurance policy at least equivalent to the protection afforded by the statutory benefits.

This option would give the benefit phase of the program, as distinct from the financing phase, a truly voluntary nature. It would encourage commercial carriers and voluntary health insurance organizations to continue their efforts to develop sound coverage plans for the senior population. Furthermore, individuals covered during employment by outstanding health insurance plans would thus be encouraged to continue such plans after retirement.

6. The program should provide at its outset for hospitalization, nursing home care and visiting nurse services, with additional benefits to be added as experience may indicate their desirability and feasibility.

A benefit schedule offering more total days of care according to the proportion spent in nursing home care and visiting nurse services would encourage beneficiaries to use less costly facilities as soon as their medical condition permitted.

Early diagnostic services should be added to the benefits as soon as possible, to help minimize instances of hospitalization. Subsequently, it should be found possible to cover broader forms of organized home-care services, the costs of certain drugs, surgery, and possibly other physician services.

7. A State agency should be chosen or established to maintain standards set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This agency would make reimbursement to hospitals, nursing homes, and visiting nurse services on the basis of actual costs. The agency would review and certify rates for payment based on actual cost as determined by uniform cost accounting methods. It would certify expenditures under the program and maintain a continuing review of operations within the State.

This program should be regarded as only one part—though a major part—of a larger overall effort to make better provision for our senior citizens who have already made their great contribution to our way of life.

For example, improved housing for the aged ranks as an important aspect of their well-being. But a sound health insurance

JUL 15 1960

A5930

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APR

program is the most urgent immediate need—to the end that the retirement years shall be made as free as possible from the crushing cost burdens and anxieties attendant upon illness.

In the achievement of these objectives, our elder citizens deserve decisive and prompt action.

The Legislative Representative of the WCTU Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including herewith "The Washington Letter," by Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, representative, bureau of legislation, Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Her report is interesting and is worth the serious consideration of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mrs. Hays is doing outstanding service on behalf of her organization. She has our commendation. Her article follows:

THE WASHINGTON LETTER

(By Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, representative, bureau of legislation)

THE AIRLINE BILLS

Congress will be closing its present session when this issue of the Union Signal comes to you, so you will have a later report on S. 1432 and H.R. 1075. The latter is still on the agenda of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives. Since the House acted favorably on similar legislation in 1957, it is assumed that the bill will pass if it can receive the attention of the entire House of Representatives.

On May 18 the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recommended S. 1432 favorably to the full committee. On May 25 the full committee discussed the bill, but did not act on it. Instead, a hearing was scheduled for June 16 for the purpose of hearing General Quesada, administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, explain why his agency feels that its new ruling is a sufficient safeguard.

During the 2-hour hearing, representatives of two airlines, National and Continental, were heard in opposition to the bill in addition to Mr. Quesada. Representatives of the Airline Pilots' Association and Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, spoke and placed in the record statements in support of S. 1432. Senator SCOTT THURMOND, of South Carolina; Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska; and Senator SCHOEPPEL brought out evidence in support of S. 1432 by their searching questions during the course of the hearing. Senator MOSS, of Utah, and CARLSON, of Kansas, filed statements in support of S. 1432. Senators ENGLE, of California, and SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, members of the committee, participated in the discussion and questioning.

Presumably, S. 1432 will again be placed on the agenda of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for consideration when the report of the June 16 hearing has been printed for their study. Letters from homefolk will be an important and possibly a deciding factor. If you have followed directives in previous issues of the

Union Signal, your own Senators and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON have heard your opinion that action on S. 1432 is vital during this session.

MORE LIQUOR TO DRINK

The distillers of this country apparently produced almost 145 million gallons of whisky in 1959, and they are looking forward with confidence to 1960 and the years throughout the "fabulous sixties." One commentator in a liquor publication gave an optimistic forecast. "All grains, including corn, rye, and barley malt are in excellent supply and at reasonably low prices. Water is plentiful, labor is plentiful and the spring of 1960 looks favorable to whisky making, at a reasonable cost."

Spirits magazine believes that 1960 will be the greatest year yet for the hard liquor interests, "greatest in sales, greatest in production, greatest in favor as a normal part of American life." They see the decade of the sixties as "prosperity, secure and growing in richness."

Spirits regards the American families with an annual income between \$4,000 and \$8,000 as the "shank of the liquor market, the bread-and-butter part of the population for the majority of distillers, importers, package stores, and bars." The number of purchases made by this salary group will not be much less than those made by higher salaried families in the over \$8,000 salary level. Nor will the proportion of money spent for liquor be much less according to Spirits.

The ascending wage scale enters into the distillers' rosy prophesy for 1960, the year that will probably be the biggest since repeal. Women and younger people are an encouraging factor. Vodka's fantastic rise is largely a young people's boom. The urban Negro and the Puerto Rican are counted upon to help the liquor industry open a golden door in 1960.

While envisioning a consumption of liquor exceeding even the historic year of 1946, Spirits still insists that drinkers are drinking less liquor. It was the spread of consumption over many customers, not the amount each consumed, that made 1959 a big year. Thomas J. Donovan, president of Licensed Beverage Industries, said per capita consumption was only 1.24 gallons, against the post-repeal average of 1.26. And that figure is 35 percent of the prohibition average, he said.

Mr. Donovan's figures do not tally with those recorded in the statistical abstract of the United States. His source of information has not been indicated. Nor has the U.S. Government made public any statistics as to the per capita consumption of illegal liquor either during prohibition or since. It would be interesting to consult the crystal ball which enables Mr. Donovan to refer to the "prohibition average."

Reprinted here are the records on per capita consumption prepared by the U.S. Government and printed annually in Statistical Abstract of the United States.

Distilled spirits—Apparent average annual per capita consumption in the continental United States, 1850-1958

[In tax gallons]

1850	2.24
1860	2.86
1870	2.07
1871-80	1.39
1881-90	1.35
1891-95	1.37
1896-1900	1.12
1901-05	1.39
1906-10	1.43
1911	1.46
1912	1.45
1913	1.51
1914	1.44
1915	1.26
1916	1.37

Distilled spirits—Apparent average annual per capita consumption in the continental United States, 1850-1958—Continued

1917	1.62
1918	.87
1919	.79
1920	.22
1921	.32
1922	.18
1923	.11
1924	.10
1925	.09
1926	.09
1927	.08
1928	.09
1929	.09
1930	.08
1931	.07
1932	.06
1933	.05
1934	.33
1935	.70
1936	.81
1937	1.03
1938	1.00
1939	.93
1940	1.02
1941	1.04
1942	1.13
1943	1.11
1944	1.03
1945	1.22
1946	1.39
1947	1.28
1948	1.06
1949	1.02
1950	1.02
1951	1.23
1952	1.00
1953	1.10
1954	1.12
1955	1.07
1956	1.13
1957	1.17
1958	1.12

(NOTE.—1922-34, inclusive, include quantities withdrawn for certain manufacturing, compounding, medicinal, and sacramental uses.)

The "prohibition average" would presumably be the per capita average for the years 1920-33, inclusive, or approximately 0.12 which does not support Mr. Donovan's contention.

The Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a speech which I gave before the United Veterans Council in San Jose, Calif., on Memorial Day, entitled "The Communist Conspiracy":

THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

(By the Honorable CHARLES S. GUBSER)

We meet today to honor those who have given their lives in the defense of our country.

We meet under another great cloud of international tension and view shattered hopes which fell when a shameless ruler in the Kremlin used the U-2 as a readymade excuse for a decision he had already made—to torpedo the summit conference and with it the hopes of the world for peace.

There is only one way in which we can truly honor our war dead and that is to